UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/583,195 | 06/14/2006 | Yves Decoster | ETF-0044 | 7712 | |
| 23413 CANTOR COL | 7590 12/18/200 BURN, LLP | EXAMINER | | | |
| 20 Church Stree | | DUNLAP, JONATHAN M | | | |
| 22nd Floor Hartford, CT 06 | 5103 | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| | | | 2855 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 12/18/2008 | ELECTRONIC | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

usptopatentmail@cantorcolburn.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|----------------|--|
| 10/583,195 | DECOSTER, YVES | |
| | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |

| | Jonathan Dunlap | 2855 | |
|---|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>13 November 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS | APPLICATION IN CONDITION F | OR ALLOWANCE. | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | g date of the final rejection | n. |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount on hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| AMENDMENTS | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti | nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); | ΓE below); | |
| appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c | | | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | mpliant Amendment (l | PTOL-324). |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | imely filed amendmer | nt canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-13. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | l be entered and an e | xplanation of |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fails | s to provide a |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | • | |
| 11. 🛮 The request for reconsideration has been conside because: See Continuation Sheet. | ered but does NOT place the applic | ation in condition for a | allowance |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| Jonathan Dunlap | /Harshad Patel/ | | |
| Examiner Art Unit: 2855 | Primary Examiner, Art U | nit 2855 | |
| | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The limitation of "automobile seat" is a new consideration, which would require further searching. With respect to Applicant's assertion of "intended purpose" and MPEP 2143.01 V, the Examiner would like to point out that neither the intended purpose, nor the principle of operation of the sensors by Fulton would change if the sensors were to be installed in an automobile seat. The intended purpose of the Fulton sensors are specifically stated as "to obtain the conductivity distribution of a pressure sensitive resistive mat placed between the patient and support surface" (Abstract). While the principle of operation of the sensor by Fulton is electrodes placed around the periphery of a resistive mat and Electrical Impedance Tomography to determine pressure distribution. By inserting the sensors in a vehicle seat, the purpose of the invention would remain, i.e. determining pressure distribution; the basic operation of the sensors would also remain, i.e. EIT and sensors at the periphery. The sensors are the device and the "clinical environment" is simply the environment in which the device is disclosed as being utilized. Structurally, the sensors by Fulton are not prohibited in any disclosure from being utilized in other environments. It would appear to the Examiner that a vehicle seat with electrodes across the seat could benefit from the technology fully disclosed by Fulton in a obvious manner and the combination would be motivated by a desire to reduce the cost of multiple electrodes.